



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/655,346	09/04/2003	Bala Dutt	5681-14900	6547
58467 MHKKG/SUN P.O. BOX 398 AUSTIN, TX 78767	7590 08/07/2008		<div>EXAMINER</div> <div>CHOU, ALAN S</div>	
			<div>ART UNIT</div> <div>2151</div>	<div>PAPER NUMBER</div>
			<div>MAIL DATE</div> <div>08/07/2008</div>	<div>DELIVERY MODE</div> <div>PAPER</div>

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/655,346

Applicant(s)

DUTT ET AL.

Examiner

ALAN S. CHOU

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/28/2008
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in responsive to amendment filed on March 28, 2008.

Claims 1-23 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5, 8-11, 12, 15, 16, 17-18, 21, 22, 23 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ng U.S. Patent Number 6,411,956 B1 (hereinafter Ng).

3. Claims 1-5, 8-11, 12, 15, 16, 17-18, 21, 22, 23 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ng, and further in view of Felt et al. U.S. Patent Number 7,080,119 B2 (hereinafter Felt).

4. As per claims 1, 12, 17, 18, 23, Ng discloses a system, comprising: an application server (see Enterprise Java Bean 141 and 142 components on column 3 line 1-10); and one or more of backend systems coupled to the application server (see external database 18 on column 1 line 11-18); wherein the one or more backend systems comprises a plurality data resources; wherein the application server comprises:

an application configured to initiate requests for connections with the plurality of data resources (see requests a database connection on column 4 line 10-17); a plurality of data sources configured to provide connections with the plurality of data resources (see table 60 associated a global transaction identifier with a physical connection on column 4 line 1-10); and wherein the application server is configured to associate an identity with each of the plurality of data sources and to use the identity to determine whether one of the plurality of data sources provides connections to the same data resource as another of the plurality of data sources (see determine connection association on column 4 line 15-27).

5. Ng does not disclose expressly the use of distinct data resources and use of an identifier to delegate the task to a distinct data sources. Felt teaches the delegation of a commit server and participating server from a plurality of servers to fulfill the request of the client request in a JDBC network environment (see selecting a commit server and participating server on column 8 line 60 to column 9 line 14). Ng and Felt are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, JDBC network management system. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate distinct data resources to fulfill client application requests. The motivation for doing so would have been to select the best suitable distinct data resources to perform the requested task. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ng with Felt for the benefit of using plurality of distinct data resources to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1, 12, 17, 18, 23.

6. As per claim 2, Ng discloses the system as recited in claim 1, wherein in response to the application requesting a connection from one of the plurality of data sources, a data source ID manager is configured to ascertain the identity of the data source from which the connection was requested and determine whether the identity matches the identity of any other of the plurality of data sources (see adapter 523 determine connection association on column 4 line 15-27).

7. As per claim 3, Ng discloses the system as recited in claim 2, wherein the data source ID manager is further configured to determine whether any of the data sources with matching identities previously supplied a connection to the application and, if a connection was previously supplied, to return the previously supplied connection to the application (see connecting with physical connection associated with the transaction step 76 on column 4 line 20-23).

8. As per claim 4, Ng discloses the system as recited in claim 3, wherein if no connection from a data source with a matching identity exists, the data source is configured to forward the request to a corresponding data source to obtain a new connection (see create new physical connection step 80 on column 4 line 15-20).

9. As per claim 5, Ng discloses the system as recited in claim 4, wherein the connection is a local connection (see physical connection on column 4 line 15-27).

10. As per claim 8, Ng discloses the system as recited in claim 1, wherein the application server is configured to instantiate a data source proxy for an abstract name of a data resource used by an application; ascertain an identity for the data source; and use the identity to link the proxy to the data source (see global transaction identifier on column 4 line 1-10).

11. As per claims 9, 15, 21, Ng discloses the system as recited in claim 8, wherein multiple data source proxies correspond to the same data source identity, wherein in response to the application requesting connections with a same data resource from multiple data source proxies, the data source proxies from which the connections were requested are configured to forward the connection requests to the data source whose identity corresponds to said proxies (see determine association on column 4 line 15-22).

12. As per claim 10, Ng discloses the system as recited in claim 1, wherein in response to a request to instantiate a data source corresponding to an abstract name, the application server is configured to determine an identity for the proposed data source, determine whether any existing data source has a matching identity, instantiate the proposed data source only if no existing data source with matching identity is found (see create new physical connection step 80 on column 4 line 17-22).

13. As per claims 11, 16, 22, Ng discloses the system as recited in claim 1, wherein the application server further comprises a transaction manager (see transaction

Art Unit: 2151

manager 124, 144, 164 on column 3 line 10-19); wherein in response to a request to commit a transaction the transaction manager is configured to identify a number of data resources participating in the transaction according to connections supplied for unique data source identities; wherein if the number of data resources participating in the transaction is two or more the transaction manager is configured to commit the transaction utilizing a two-phase commit protocol (see two-phase commit protocol on column 1 line 31-43); and wherein if only one data resource participating in the transaction the transaction manager is configured to commit the transaction utilizing a one-phase commit optimization (see column 1 line 25-30).

14. Claims 6-7, 13-14, 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ng as applied to claim 1 above, further in view of Felt et al. U.S. Patent Number 7,080,119 B2 (hereinafter Felt), and further in view of Yousefi'zadeh U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0030739 A1 (hereinafter Yousefi'zadeh).

15. As per claims 6-7, 13-14, 19-20, Ng discloses checking of a requested connection is associated with a pre-existing virtual connection. Ng does not disclose expressly the identity comprise values for data source properties. Yousefi'zadeh teaches the use of data source properties such as URL, name of database, and user name to identify connection as they are created (see page 8 section [0078]). Ng and Yousefi'zadeh are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor,

Art Unit: 2151

JDBC database connection management systems. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use data source properties to identify connections. The motivation for doing so would have been to use pertinent and readily available values to identify data source. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ng with Yousefi'zadeh to obtain the identity for the data source to obtain the invention as specified in claims 6-7, 13-14, 19-20.

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a) System and Method for Transaction Processing with Delegated Commit Feature by Felt et al., U.S. Patent Number 7,080,119 B2.

b) Method and Apparatus for Multiple Security Service Enablement in a Data Processing System by Albaugh et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,687,831 B1.

c) Method for Accessing Object Linking-embedding Database Data via Java Database Connectivity by Johnson, U.S. Patent Number 7,089,566 B1.

d) Database Load Balancing for Multi-tier Computer Systems by Yousefi'zadeh, U.S. Patent Number 6,950,848 B1.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed March 28, 2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 12, 17, 18, 23, under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn.

However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Felt et al. U.S. Patent Number 7,080,119 B2.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alan S. Chou whose telephone number is (571) 272-5779. The examiner can normally be reached on 7am-3pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571)272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AC

/John Follansbee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2151

